

## **REMARKS**

This is a response to the Office Action dated May 6, 2004. Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to informalities in the specification. In addition, claims 1-9, 11, 14-15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1, 3-10, and 12-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,195,181 to Stewart F. Bryant et al. ("Bryant et al."). Additionally, the Examiner noted that claims 2 and 11, insofar as they were definite, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form with all of the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

To clarify the use in the pending claims and to hereby provide notice to the public, the phrase "at least one of <A>, <B>, ... and <N>" is defined by the Applicant in the broadest sense, superceding any other implied definitions herebefore or hereinafter unless expressly asserted by the Applicant to the contrary, to mean one or more elements selected from the group comprising A, B, ... and N, that is to say, any combination of one or more of the elements A, B, ... or N including any one element alone or in combination with one or more of the other elements which may also include, in combination, additional elements not listed. This definition adds no new matter and is supported by the specification.

The rejections from the Office Action of May 6, 2004 are discussed below in connection with the various claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

### **I. OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include reference signs mentioned in the description. The Examiner also objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference signs not mentioned in the description. With this response, replacement drawings complying with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) have been provided for figures 3, 5 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request these objections of the drawings be withdrawn.

## **II. OBJECTIONS TO THE TITLE**

The Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive. With this response, Applicants have amended the title and respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

## **III. OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION**

The Examiner objected to the specification for failing to comply with informalities. With this response, Applicants have amended the specification and respectfully request these objections be withdrawn.

## **IV. OBJECTIONS TO THE ABSTRACT**

The Examiner objected to the abstract for failing to enable one to quickly determine from a cursory inspection the nature of the invention. With this response, Applicants have amended the abstract and respectfully request this objection be withdrawn.

## **V. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 1-9, 11, 14-15, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. With this response, claims 1, 5, and 19 have been amended for clarity. With respect to claims 2 and 6, the Examiner rejected the claims noting that the specification does not set forth a definition or other guidance explaining what is meant by the phrase “substantially all.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion to the extent that the phrase “substantially all” should be interpreted outside of its ordinary meaning. Applicants submit that claims 1-9, 11, 14-15, and 19 should be allowed and respectfully request that these rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

## **VI. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bryant et al. Additionally, the Examiner noted that claims 2 and 11, if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of their respective base claims, would be allowable. With this response independent claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 11 and claims 2 and 11

have been cancelled. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-9 and 12-18 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bryant et al. With this response, claims 4-6, 8, 13, and 17-18 have been amended for clarity. These amendments are supported by the specification, and no new matter has been added. Dependent claims 3-9 and 12-18 should be allowed for the reasons set out above for the independent claims. Applicants therefore request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection of these claims.

## **VII. IDS**


A complete copy of U.S. Application Serial No. 09/602,286 is included herewith for consideration by the Examiner.

## **SUMMARY**

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated May 6, 2004 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 30, 2004



James L. Katz  
Registration No. 42,711  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200